2
 3
 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HENDRIX MORENO MONTECASTRO,	Case No.: 1:20-cv-00689-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff, v. NEWSOM, et al.,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER, FAILURE TO PROSECUTE, AND FAILURE TO STATE A COGNIZABLE CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Defendants.) (ECF No. 6)))

Plaintiff Hendrix Moreno Montecastro is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On August 25, 2020, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint, found no cognizable claims, and granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within thirty days. (ECF No. 6.) However, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise communicated with the Court, and the time in which to do so has passed.

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why the instant action should not be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's August 25, 2020 order, failure to prosecute, and failure to state a claim for relief. Plaintiff can comply with this order to show cause by filing an amended complaint in compliance with the Court's August 25, 2020 screening order. <u>Plaintiff is</u>

1	warned that failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation to a District Judge that		
2	the instant action be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order,		
3	and failure to state a cognizable claim for relief.		
4	4		
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.	SIP	
6	Dated: October 13, 2020	July N. Lave	
7	I INTE	TED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
8	3		
9			
10			
11	1		
12			
13	3		
14	1		
15	5		
16	5		
17	7		
18	3		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	7		